

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 24, 1941

The ninth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1941 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Saturday, May 24, 1941. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,

Mr. Lamb,

Mr. Manship,

Mr. Bruce,

Dr. Cret,

Mr. Holabird,

Mr. Poor,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary

and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting

held May 9, 1941, were approved.

2. PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF EAST CAPITOL STREET: With Mr. Holabird

in the Chair, Mr. Clarke explained a Plan for the Development of East

Capitol Street prepared by Jay Downer and Gilmore D. Clarke for the Public Roads Administration, and submitted by that office through Public Roads Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and that for purposes of future reference it would be well if the Commission of Fine Arts were to approve the Plan.

Mr. Clarke said: "A Plan for developing East Capitol Street should have been prepared years ago, and the development of the city eastward in recent

years and its consequent effect on traffic made it very desirable to have such

a Plan made without further delay. Accordingly, the Public Roads Administration

asked Jay Downer and myself to prepare a traffic study for East Capitol Street.

However, the problem of traffic could not be solved without making a study of

the whole area and this is the result. The National Capital Park and Planning

Commission suggested a main artery of travel through the center of East Capitol

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 24, 1941

The ninth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year

1941 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Saturday,

May 24, 1941. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,

Mr. Lamb,

Mr. Manship,

Mr. Bruce,

Dr. Gret,

Mr. Holabird,

Mr. Poor,

also H. P. Gessmerer, Secretary

and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting

held May 9, 1941, were approved.

2. PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF EAST CAPITOL STREET: With Mr. Holabird

in the Chair, Mr. Clarke explained a plan for the development of East

Capitol Street prepared by Jay Downer and Gilmore D. Clarke for the Public

Roads Administration, and submitted by that office through Public Roads

Commissioner Thomas H. MacDonald.

Mr. Clarke said: "A plan for developing East Capitol Street should have

been prepared years ago, and the development of the city eastward in recent

years and its consequent effect on traffic made it very desirable to have such

a plan made without further delay. Accordingly, the Public Roads Administration

asked Jay Downer and myself to prepare a traffic study for East Capitol Street.

However, the problem of traffic could not be solved without making a study of

the whole area and this is the result. The National Capital Park and Planning

Commission suggested a main artery of travel through the center of East Capitol

Street. I thought it would be more dignified to allow an Avenue through the center of East Capitol Street lined with marble public and semi-public buildings and limited traffic on the Avenue, and then have the regular through traffic on Constitution Avenue and Independence Avenue extended eastward and back of the marble buildings; subordinate Government buildings would be along Constitution and Independence Avenues extended. Then we

May 6, 1941.
The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.
considered routing traffic over the Capitol Grounds, and the thought occurred to me that we should have tunnels under Capitol Hill on the north and south sides, along the lines of Constitution and Independence Avenues; acceptable person? we found we had a three foot clearance over the railroad tunnel crossing the Capitol Grounds north and south." 117 East Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the Plan. Mr. Manship said "It is a grand and noble scheme", and voiced the opinion of the Commission in this matter, as all the other members of the Commission were likewise

May 14, 1941.
I would like to refer the attached letter, referred to enthusiastic over the Plan. Committee on White House Furnishings, with this information:

Mr. Clarke said the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has approved the Plan, as have also the Public Roads Administration and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and that for purposes of future reference it would be well if the Commission of Fine Arts were on record as approving the Plan. Mr. Clarke brought the matter to the attention of the Commission

and upon his recommendation the correspondence was referred to the Special Committee on White House Furnishings, and specifically to Mr. David E. Finley, motion properly moved and seconded the Plan was unanimously approved (Exhibit A). Director of the National Gallery of Art and a member of the Committee, for

Mr. Clarke expressed his appreciation of the action taken. He stated also that the Plan makes 4,500,000 square feet of space available for public buildings, and that effort would be made to acquire some of the land in the near future. He mentioned the Army Medical Museum, plans for which have

Street. I thought it would be more dignified to allow an Avenue through

the center of East Capitol Street lined with marble public and semi-public

buildings and limited traffic on the Avenue, and then have the regular

through traffic on Constitution Avenue and Independence Avenue extended

eastward and back of the marble buildings; subordinate Government buildings

would be along Constitution and Independence Avenues extended. Then we

considered routing traffic over the Capitol grounds, and the thought

occurred to me that we should have tunnels under Capitol Hill on the north

and south sides, along the lines of Constitution and Independence Avenues;

we found we had a three foot clearance over the railroad tunnel crossing the

Capitol grounds north and south."

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the Plan. Mr. Manship

said "It is a grand and noble scheme", and voiced the opinion of the Commission

in this matter, as all the other members of the Commission were likewise

enthusiastic over the Plan.

Mr. Clarke said the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has

approved the Plan, as have also the Public Roads Administration and the

Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and that for purposes of future

reference it would be well if the Commission of Fine Arts were on record

as approving the Plan.

Mr. Holabird then asked for any further comments, and thereupon on

motion properly moved and seconded the Plan was unanimously approved (Exhibit A).

Mr. Clarke expressed his appreciation of the action taken. He stated also

that the Plan makes 4,500,000 square feet of space available for public

buildings, and that effort would be made to acquire some of the land in the

near future. He mentioned the Army Medical Museum, plans for which have

authorized for a location in the square east of the Folger Shakespeare Library, facing East Capitol Street.

3. PORTRAIT BY GILBERT STUART: Mr. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher of the White House, referred to the secretary a letter that had been sent to the President as follows:

May 6, 1941.

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

To the President: Will you be kind enough to let me know if the White House has a George Washington portrait by Gilbert Stuart? If not, would you like to have one of the six best known ones of Stuart's unquestionably authentic, if presented to the White House by an acceptable person?

Respectfully submitted,

Nejib Hekimian,

3117 Hiatt Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Caemmerer stated that he referred the correspondence to the Chairman with the following Memorandum.

May 14, 1941.

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Clarke:

I would like to refer the attached letter, referred to me by Mr. Crim, to your Committee on White House Furnishings, with this information:

The so-called Gilbert Stuart of George Washington in the White House is a copy by a painter named Winstanley, who made a business of copying Stuart's portraits. Whether or not Gilbert Stuart ever saw the portrait or gave it the touch of his brush, during his stay in Washington 1804-05, or whether Stuart's daughter, who was a painter, helped on it, is not known."

Mr. Clarke brought the matter to the attention of the Commission and upon his recommendation the correspondence was referred to the Special Committee on White House Furnishings, and specifically to Mr. David E. Finley, Director of the National Gallery of Art and a member of the Committee, for report at the next meeting of the Committee at the White House on June 9th.

The secretary was requested to inform Mr. Finley concerning this matter (Exhibit)

4. CHINA SERVICE MEDAL: Under date of May 15, 1941, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation sent the following letter to the Commission:

authorized for a location in the square east of the Folger Shakespeare Library, facing East Capitol Street.

Portrait by Gilbert Stuart: Mr. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher of the

White House, referred to the secretary a letter that had been sent to

the President as follows:

May 6, 1941.

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

To the President: Will you be kind enough to let me know if the

White House has a George Washington portrait by Gilbert Stuart? If not,

would you like to have one of the six best known ones of Stuart's

and acceptably authentic, if presented to the White House by an

acceptable person?

Respectfully submitted,
Nedip Heikman,
3117 Hitt Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Geemeyer stated that he referred the correspondence to the Chairman with the following Memorandum.

May 14, 1941.

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Clarke: members of the Commission were likewise

I would like to refer the attached letter, referred to

me by Mr. Crim, to your Committee on White House Furnishings,

with this information:

The so-called Gilbert Stuart of George Washington in the

White House is a copy by a painter named Winastley, who made

a business of copying Stuart's portraits. Whether or not

Gilbert Stuart ever saw the portrait or gave it the touch of

his brush, during his stay in Washington 1804-05, or whether

Stuart's daughter, who was a painter, helped on it, is not known."

Mr. Clarke brought the matter to the attention of the Commission

and upon his recommendation the correspondence was referred to the Special

Committee on White House Furnishings, and specifically to Mr. David E. Finley,

Director of the National Gallery of Art and a member of the Committee, for

report at the next meeting of the Committee at the White House on June 2nd.

The secretary was requested to inform Mr. Finley concerning this matter (Exhibit)

Under date of May 15, 1941, the Chief of the

Bureau of Navigation sent the following letter to the Commission:

"In compliance with your request of March 11, 1941, there is forwarded herewith the plaster model of the design of the new China Service Medal with a photograph of the design reduced to the actual size of the medal for which it will be used.

The contract for the manufacture of these medals must be entered into with the United States Mint before June 30, 1941, this being the date that the appropriation for this medal lapses. If, in the opinion of the Commission, any changes in the model of the medal are considered necessary it will be appreciated if this office is advised immediately."

C. W. Nimitz

The secretary stated that he had sent a photograph of the model and copy of the letter to Mr. Manship for comment, and Mr. Manship reported as follows:

May 23, 1941

"The photographs showing the latest model of the China Service medal have been handed to me for comment.

"I can only say that it is unfortunate that the Navy Department does not secure finer examples of the medallic art for their medals. The selection of this particular model has evidently been made without aesthetic consideration. The composition, as well as the treatment of form, of this medal is commonplace and without merit.

"In order to assist the Government Departments in securing fine examples of the medallic art, I recommend that, in future, models be submitted to a Jury of experts capable of judging the sculptural merit of the work."

A discussion took place. The Commission agreed with Mr. Manship that the Navy Department should consult experts in selecting designs, but pointed out that the Department was submitting the design to this Commission for that purpose. It was recalled that the first design, submitted in September, 1940, was not accepted by the Navy Department because an objection was made to the design of a ship employed in the design (No.19 a), based on the fact that the type of ship depicted has not been present on the China Station in recent years, whereas the medal is to commemorate actions subsequent to 1934. Therefore, a new design, No.22, was submitted by the Navy Department in December, 1940, showing a Chinese pagoda, but this was not accepted by the Navy Department because

"In compliance with your request of March 11, 1941, there is forwarded herewith the plaster model of the design of the new China Service Medal with a photograph of the design reduced to the actual size of the medal for which it will be used. The contract for the manufacture of these medals must be entered into with the United States Mint before June 30, 1941, this being the date that the appropriation for this medal lapses. If, in the opinion of the Commission, any changes in the model of the medal are considered necessary it will be appreciated if this office is advised immediately."

C. W. Nimitz

The secretary stated that he had sent a photograph of the model and copy of the letter to Mr. Manship for comment, and Mr. Manship reported as follows:

May 23, 1941

"The photographs showing the latest model of the China Service medal have been handed to me for comment. I can only say that it is unfortunate that the Navy Department does not secure finer examples of the medallic art for their medals. The selection of this particular model has evidently been made without aesthetic consideration. The composition, as well as the treatment of form, of this medal is commonplace and without merit. In order to assist the Government Departments in securing fine examples of the medallic art, I recommend that, in future, models be submitted to a jury of experts capable of judging the sculptural merit of the work."

A discussion took place. The Commission agreed with Mr. Manship that the Navy Department should consult experts in selecting designs, but pointed out that the Department was submitting the design to this Commission for that purpose. It was recalled that the first design submitted in September, 1940, was not accepted by the Navy Department because an objection was made to the design of a ship depicted in the design (No. 19 a), based on the fact that the type of ship depicted has not been present on the China Station in recent years, whereas the medal is to commemorate actions subsequent to 1934. Therefore, a new design, No. 22, was submitted by the Navy Department in December, 1940, showing a Chinese pagoda, but this was not accepted by the Navy Department because

it was found to be a replica of the Temple of the Dragon at Shanghai, and the Chinese Embassy had objected to the use of a Pagoda for a medal.

The Commission concurred in the criticisms by Mr. Manship to this third design submitted by the Navy Department. The model was thereupon disapproved, and the Navy Department was informed accordingly (Exhibit C).

5. SCULPTURE FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT: The Commission met in the Office of Mr. Bruce, Section of Fine Arts, to inspect models for sculpture for the War Department Building.

Mr. Bruce submitted a design of a relief by Jean de Marco, to be placed under the portico on the main facade. This was inspected by the Commission, and Mr. Manship made the following comments:

"I suggest that the barn in the secondary plane of the agricultural composition be restudied and perhaps eliminated. Also I suggest securing better balance in the ladder-fruit gatherer composition, making the design vertically with the kneeling figure at the base of the ladder. Otherwise approved with enthusiasm."

Accordingly, on the recommendation of Mr. Manship, the Commission approved the design, subject to the suggested changes above indicated. The relief will be in limestone 37 feet long by 11 feet 6 inches high.

Thereupon Mr. Bruce brought to the attention of the Commission three sets of small models selected by a jury recently, consisting of Carl Milles, William Zorach, Edgar Miller, sculptors, and Wm. Dewey Foster, one of the architects of the War Department Building. Mr. Bruce said these models had been selected out of 360 models submitted in competition for sculptural groups to flank the entrance to the War Department Building.

The models by Leo Steppat, an Austrian living in Washington, represented kneeling warriors; Salvatore Ferugio, of the Bronx, New York, submitted models of rather bulky horses and figures. Earl Thorp, of Danville,

in the War Department Building, flanking the proposed mural painting.

it was found to be a replica of the Temple of the Dragon at Shanghai, and the Chinese Embassy had objected to the use of a temple for a medal. The Commission concurred in the criticism by Mr. Manship to this third design submitted by the Navy Department. The model was thereupon disapproved, and the Navy Department was informed accordingly (Exhibit C).

5. SCULPTURE FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT: The Commission met in the Office

of Mr. Bruce, Section of Fine Arts, to inspect models for sculpture for the War Department Building.

Mr. Bruce submitted a design of a relief by Jean de Marco, to be placed under the portico on the main facade. This was inspected by the Commission, and Mr. Manship made the following comments:

"I suggest that the barn in the secondary plane of the agricultural composition be retained and perhaps eliminated. Also I suggest securing better balance in the ladder-fruit gathering composition, making the design vertically with the kneeling figure at the base of the ladder. Otherwise approved with enthusiasm."

Accordingly, on the recommendation of Mr. Manship, the Commission approved the design, subject to the suggested changes above indicated.

The relief will be in limestone 37 feet long by 11 feet 6 inches high.

Thereupon Mr. Bruce brought to the attention of the Commission three sets of small models selected by a jury recently, consisting of Carl Milles, William Zorach, Edgar Miller, sculptors, and Wm. Dewey Foster, one of the architects of the War Department Building. Mr. Bruce said these models had been selected out of 350 models submitted in competition for sculptural groups to flank the entrance to the War Department Building.

The models by Leo Steppat, an Austrian living in Washington, represented kneeling warriors; Salvatore Ferrigno, of the Bronx, New York, submitted models of rather bulky horses and figures. Earl Thorp, of Danville,

Connecticut, submitted models of reclining male and female figures to represent, it was said, War and Peace. The jury had asked these sculptors for further studies, so that the models were not submitted for formal action by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Finally Mr. Bruce submitted two revised designs of the Eagle, by Henry Kreis, to be placed over the entrance of the War Department Building, flanked by "soldier groups". The model of an Eagle with its head turned and the wings given a fuller treatment the Commission felt was a great improvement over the "pigeon like" eagle first designed. The second revised model showing an Eagle with the wings so placed as to give the appearance of depth to the model was not favored by the Commission.

At noon the Commission inspected a full-sized solar print of the models of the eagle in place at the War Department Building. The architects of the building and Mr. Louis Simon, Acting Commissioner of Public Buildings, were also present. The Commission were unanimous that the model of the eagle with its head turned and the wings given fuller treatment was the best of the three models, and upon the recommendation of Mr. Manship the Commission approved it with the suggestion that the sculptor be authorized to carry it out.

As for the flanking "soldier groups", the Commission felt that the eagle over the entrance and the proposed large flanking sculptural groups would be sufficient, omitting the two "soldier groups" proposed for each side of the eagle. The suggestion was then made by Mr. Poor that the "soldier groups" be placed in the building. The other members of the Commission became interested in the suggestion, and one of the full-sized silhouettes was set in place in the lobby of the building, where the "soldier groups" would be placed, one on each of the side walls of the entrance lobby in the War Department building, flanking the proposed mural painting.

Connecticut, submitted models of buildings, and some of them to represent, it was said, at the time. The jury had asked these questions for further studies, as the models were not submitted for final

action by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Finally Mr. Jones submitted two revised designs of the building, by

Henry Lewis, to be placed over the entrance of the War Department Building,

labeled by "soldier groups". The model of an eagle with its head turned

and the wings given a better treatment and the Commission felt was a great

improvement over the "pigeon" design, which was first designed. The second

revised model showing an eagle with the wings so placed as to give the

appearance of depth to the model was not favored by the Commission.

At noon the Commission inspected a full-sized color print of the

models of the eagle in place at the War Department Building. The architects

of the building and Mr. Louis Simon, Acting Commissioner of Public Buildings,

were also present. The Commission were unanimous that the model of the

eagle with its head turned and the wings given better treatment was the best

of the three models, and upon the recommendation of Mr. Lewis the Commission

approved it with the suggestion that the architect be authorized to carry it out.

As for the labeling "soldier groups", the Commission felt that the

eagle over the entrance and the proposed large flanking sculptural groups

would be sufficient, omitting the two "soldier groups" proposed for each

side of the eagle. The suggestion was then made by Mr. Lewis that the

"soldier groups" be placed in the building. The other members of the

Commission became interested in the suggestion, and one of the full-sized

models was set in place in the lobby of the building, where the "soldier

groups" would be placed, one on each of the side walls of the entrance lobby

in the War Department Building, flanking the proposed mural painting.

Dr. Cret felt the lobby looks a good deal like a back stage view and needs the sculptural groups to justify the big walls. The Commission were unanimous in feeling that the "soldier groups" placed against the Colorado pink travertine and flanking the War Department mural painting would be a distinguished contribution to the interior embellishment of the building. The Commission suggested to Mr. Bruce that he bring this matter to the attention of Mr. Kreis for his views and suggestions on the subject. Mr. Manship felt the "soldier groups" should be possibly in bronze, 6 or 7 feet high. A report was sent to Mr. Bruce (Exhibit D).

6. MURAL PAINTING FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT: The Commission discussed the mural painting for the War Department, the design for which had been given approval by the Commission at the meeting on May 9th, subject to certain criticism by the National Education Association and the Teachers College of Columbia University that "Education" had not been represented in the painting. The correspondence had been referred to Mr. Poor and to Mr. Bruce as a committee to consider the "protests" and Mr. Poor reported in behalf of the committee as follows:

"I think the letters from Mr. Givens of the National Education Association and from Mabel Carney of Teachers College, Columbia, are part of a very fine and general public interest in the murals which are going into our public buildings.

"I would like to point out, however, that in dealing with such a theme as the "four Freedoms and their defense by our military establishments", which is the subject of Mr. Kindred McLeary's proposed mural for the War Department, an artist must reduce these concepts to their simplest and most fundamental terms. As they spread out into more particularized institutions, their number becomes legion.

"So I would remind any people with particularized interests, such as the Education group, not to be so short-sighted as to fail to see their own cherished institutions as the logical outgrowth of the freedom of speech--of press--of assembly--of worship, and not to feel slighted if they do not find an actual and recognizable school-house in the mural. I am, however, so aware of the

Mr. Clegg left the lobby looking a good deal like a man who had been
in the company of a very large crowd to testify the big battle. The Commission
were anxious in hearing that the "Soldier Group" should be the
offered with everything and then the new department would be
would be a distinguished contribution to the history and development of
the building. The Commission suggested to Mr. Clegg that he bring this
matter to the attention of Mr. Clegg for his views and suggestions on the
subject. Mr. Clegg left the "Soldier Group" should be possibly in
power, 6 or 7 feet high. A report was sent to Mr. Clegg (March 10).

8. After talking to the new department, the Commission discussed
the main problem for the new department, the basis for which had been
given approval by the Commission at the meeting on May 10th, subject to
certain criticism by the National Association of Teachers and the Teachers
College of Columbia University that "Education" had not been mentioned
in the plan. The correspondence had been referred to Mr. Clegg and
to Mr. Clegg as a committee to consider the "Education" and Mr. Clegg
reported in behalf of the committee as follows:

"I think the letters from Mr. Clegg of the National Association
Association and from James O'Connell of Teachers College, Columbia
are part of a very fine and general public interest in the matter
which are going into our public building.
"I would like to point out, however, that in dealing with such
a thing as the "Education" and their relation to our military
establishment, which is the subject of Mr. Clegg's letter, these
letters to the National Association of Teachers and the Teachers
spread out into more practical questions, their number
becomes legion.
"So I would remind any people with practicalized interests,
even as the Education group, not to be so short-sighted as to fail
to see their own practical interest as the logical outcome of
the freedom of speech--of press--of assembly--of religion, and not
to feel alarmed if they do not find an actual and recognizable
school-house in the matter. I am, however, a man of law

tremendous part Public Education has played in the development of American institutions and life that I suggest sending all this correspondence to Mr. McLeary with the humble plea that he find, if possible, some place in the mural for at least one tiny recognizable school-house and book."

The Commission endorsed the report by Mr. Poor unanimously, and it was suggested that it be embodied in a letter to be sent to the artist Mr. Kindred McLeary (Exhibit E).

7. MURAL PAINTING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE: Mr. Louis Simon, Supervising Architect, resubmitted the photograph of the mural painting by Clara Fargo Thomas illustrating the steel industry, which officials of the Department of Commerce would like to have placed in the library of that building.

The Commission, after consideration, decided that the painting would be inappropriate in the library of the Department of Commerce Building, and the placing of the painting in the building was again disapproved (Exhibit F) as buildings was held in storage pending a

The Commission felt that at some future time a mural painting should be specifically painted for the location in question.

8. DESIGNS FOR TEMPORARY OFFICE BUILDINGS: Under date of May 17, 1941, the following letter was received from Mr. W. E. Noll, Acting Supervising Architect:

"In further reference to proposed temporary office buildings to be erected in this city, there are forwarded to you enclosed, for comment and advice, four sets of blueprints of sketches showing a further proposed temporary office building to be erected at 26th Street and Constitution Avenue.

"The exterior design of the building will be similar to that shown by the typical elevations submitted to you on April 28th.

"There are also forwarded to you enclosed, for comment and advice, four sets of blueprints showing a revised layout of the buildings to be erected on the War Department site between 22nd and 23d Streets and C and E Streets, N.W."

The various parts of the building have been in the possession of the various departments and the life of the building is now in the hands of the various departments. It is possible that the building will be used for a long time.

The Commission has received the report of the various departments and has decided to proceed with the building.

It was suggested that it be amended in a letter to be sent to the

artist Mr. Richard Henry (Exhibit 1).

V. THE BUILDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE: Mr. Davis

Superior Architect, submitted the photograph of the building by the State House. The building is a large building, which officials of the Department of Commerce would like to have placed in the library of that building.

The Commission, after consideration, decided that the building

would be inappropriate in the library of the Department of Commerce. The building is a large building, and the placing of the building in the library was again disapproved (Exhibit 2).

The Commission felt that at some future time a small building

should be specifically planned for the location in question.

6. THE BUILDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE: Under date of May 17,

1941, the following letter was received from Mr. W. E. Hall, Acting

Superior Architect:

"In further reference to proposed temporary office buildings to be erected in this city, there are enclosed to you enclosed, for your information and advice, two sets of drawings of buildings showing a further proposed temporary office building to be erected at 235 West 1st and 2nd Streets. The exterior design of the building will be similar to that shown by the typical drawings submitted to you on April 27th. There are also forwarded to you enclosed, two copies and advice, two sets of drawings showing a revised layout of the building to be erected on the lot between 235 West 1st and 2nd Streets and 235 West 2nd and 3rd Streets, N.E."

Mr. Simon stated that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has approved the erection of the building at 26th Street and Constitution Avenue, and there was no objection to the building for 22d and C Street or in that locality.

The Commission noted that in design these buildings will be similar to temporary office buildings heretofore approved, and approved it with the understanding that these structures are for use during the present emergency and that they will be demolished at the termination of this emergency period. (Exhibit G)

9. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: The secretary presented the following plans that had been received from the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia for projects coming within the Shipstead-Luce Act area:

(a) Design for apartment building at 20th and E Streets, Square 104:

The Commission had considered the design at the meeting on May 9th, but a report to the Inspector of Buildings was held in abeyance pending consideration of the location by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. That Commission considered the design at a meeting held on May 23, 1941, and

Mr. F. A. Delano, Chairman, reported as follows:

May 23, 1941.

"My dear Major Clarke:

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts, appeared before our Commission today and stated that an application had been made to the District Commissioners for a permit to erect a building on the Southeast corner of Square 104. He stated further that the preliminary plans had been submitted to your Commission and that they would have to be approved or disapproved by tomorrow (May 24, 1941), or else, under the law, no action by your Commission would be an automatic assent to the plans.

The Commission is very much concerned over this proposed construction because it is on a square that Congress has set aside for public buildings (Public Building Act for 1926 Amended), and

Mr. Simon stated that the Commission had received the objection of the building at 1000 and 1001
and building at 1002, and there was no objection to the building

for 224 and C Street or in that locality.

The Commission noted that in design these buildings will be
similar to ten-story office buildings heretofore approved, and approved
it with the understanding that these structures are for use during the
present emergency and that they will be demolished at the termination of
this emergency period. (Exhibit G) and the Commission

3. The Commission has received the following plans that have been received from the Inspector of Buildings of

the District of Columbia for projects coming within the proposed zone:

(a) Design for apartment building at 1000 and 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004:

The Commission has considered the design at the meeting on May 22, but a
report to the Inspector of Buildings was held in abeyance pending consultation
of the location by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. That
Commission considered the design at a meeting held on May 23, 1941, and

Mr. J. A. Belmont, Chairman, reported as follows:

May 23, 1941

"My dear Mayor Clarke: The Commission has received the following plans:

1. J. A. Belmont, Secretary of the Commission of the District of Columbia, reported before the Commission today and stated that an application
had been made to the District Commissioners for a permit to erect a
building on the southeast corner of Square 100. He stated further
that the preliminary plans had been submitted to your Commission and
that they will have to be approved or disapproved by tomorrow (May 24,
1941), or else, when the Commission will be
an affirmative action to the plan.

The Commission is very much concerned over this proposed
construction because it is an example that Congress has set before
for public buildings (Public Building Act for 1935 amended), and

has thus authorized its purchase. A part of the square is already in Government ownership, having been acquired by the Alley Dwelling Authority. It would be very desirable, of course, to prevent the erection of any building on this square.

The Commission also felt that it is a grave question as to whether or not this particular design for an eight-story apartment building would harmonize with Government buildings, which would be erected on the Squares immediately to the South of Square 104, and on the lots already owned by the Government. It appears that it would be objectionable because it would not harmonize with any building that the Government proposes to build.

The Fine Arts Commission is, therefore, requested to weigh these matters most carefully before giving their approval or assent to the erection of the proposed apartment house on the Southeast corner of Square 104.

Respectfully,

Frederic A. Delano,
Chairman."

The architect members of the Commission inspected the plans carefully. They considered the design to be acceptable and felt that there should be no objection to giving preliminary approval to the design, in justice to the architect and to the Commission; subject to the submission of working drawings and samples of material to be used; also that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia should withhold a permit until the interests of the Government in the location in question had been settled (Exhibit H).

It was noted that the apartment would be in the square to the north of the Plaza to front the proposed Annex to the Federal Reserve Building.

(b) On the recommendation of Mr. Lamb, the Commission approved a design for a residence at 3217 Aberfoyle Place, Northwest (Application No.912).

(c) On the recommendation of Mr. Lamb, the Commission approved a design for a series of residences at Waterside Drive (near the Rock Creek Parkway), to be similar to several already built and approved by the Commission some years ago.

has been included its purchase. A part of the square is already in
possession of the City, having been acquired by the Alley Dwelling Authority.
It would be very desirable, of course, to prevent the erection of any
building on this square.
The Commission also felt that it is a grave mistake to allow any
not this particular design for an eight-story apartment building which
is in line with the Government building, which would be erected on the
square. It is also in the line of the square, and on the left side
of the square. It is also in the line of the square, and on the left side
because it would not harmonize with the building that the Government
proposes to build.
The Fine Arts Commission is, therefore, requested to refuse to
approve any design which is in line with the Government building or
any of the proposed apartment houses on the Government corner
of square 104.

Respectfully,

Frederic H. Brown,
Chairman.

The architect members of the Commission approved the plans originally.
They considered the design to be acceptable and felt that there should be
no objection to giving preliminary approval to the design, in order to the
architect and to the Commission; subject to the submission of working drawings
and samples of material to be used; also that the Commission of the
District of Columbia should withhold a permit until the interests of the
Government in the location in question had been settled (Exhibit A).
It was noted that the apartment would be in the square to the north
of the block to front the proposed square to the Federal Reserve Building.
(b) On the recommendation of Mr. Wood, the Commission approved a
design for a residence at 3111 Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest (Exhibit B).
(c) On the recommendation of Mr. Wood, the Commission approved a design
for a series of residences at Wisconsin Avenue (Exhibit C).
to be similar to several already built and approved by the Commission some

There are

(d) The secretary presented plans for several residences designed by Joseph Abel, architect, to be erected at 4020-4036 Arkansas Avenue (northwest), application No.909. These were inspected by the architect members and upon their recommendation approved by the Commission.

(e) Apartment Building at 1929 E Street, Northwest: In accordance with a suggestion made by the Commission at the meeting on May 9th, Mr. Joseph Abel, architect, conferred with Mr. Lamb concerning the design for a proposed apartment building at 1929 E Street, Northwest. Mr. Lamb made numerous changes in the plans and brought them to the attention of Mr. Abel for resubmission of the plans.

(Mr. Abel resubmitted the plans revised to show the changes recommended by Mr. Lamb, who approved a set of the drawings, sent to him by the secretary on May 29th, and they were approved by the Chairman, in behalf of the Commission on June 9, 1941)

(f) Store building at 1901 E Street, Northwest: A set of plans ~~was~~ was received from the Building Inspector for a one-story commercial building to be erected at 1901 E Street, Northwest (Application No.913). ~~was~~

The plans were inspected by the architect members of the Commission and approved. It was noted that the building will be adjacent to the North Interior Department building. The building will have a length of 89 feet on E Street, 12 feet on 19th Street, and will be 14 feet high; to be a building faced with limestone and alberine (black serpentine) base.

10. HOUSE RESOLUTION 176, THE RESCUE BY HORATIO GREENOUGH: Mr. Manship stated that he and Mr. Lamb inspected the marble group in front of the Capitol entitled "The Rescue" by Horatio Greenough, the removal of which is suggested by the Resolution, since there are some who think the monument is an insult to the Indians of the present day. Mr. Manship reported

(a) The Secretary presented the following recommendations:

by the Commission, and he suggested that the Commission should be authorized to make such changes in the plans as may be necessary. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

(b) The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

Mr. Abel for resubmission of the plans.

(c) The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

(d) The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them. The Commission, after considering the recommendations, decided to accept them.

on the Resolution as follows:

May 23, 1941

"Referring to Bill No. H. Res. 176, with regard to the marble group by the sculptor Horatio Greenough, on the right-hand side of the steps to the central east portico of the National Capitol, entitled "The Rescue", representing a Redskin held in restraint by a pioneer, and a mother clasping a child in her arms, this is a group of fine composition and serious execution in the classical manner, possessing dignity and beauty of sculptural treatment, and worthy of the honored position in which it stands.

"It must be noted that the American Indian represented in this group shows fine physical development, and is a splendid representative of his race, and, whatever may be the criticism in regard to the undignified situation in which the Indian finds himself, that would hardly outweigh the consideration of high artistic merit of the group and its great value as Americana, it having been executed about one hundred years ago. To cause it to be removed would be a great mistake.

"The recommendation to perpetuate the memory of the Great Indian leaders is admirable and should be carried out, but not at the expense of "The Rescue".

The Resolution reads in part, as follows:

RESOLVED, The Senate concurring, that the statuary group entitled "The Rescue" be removed from the pedestal at the base of the main staircase of the National Capitol and that there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed \$15,000 for a statue of one of the great Indian leaders famous in American history, such as Sequoia, Massasoit, Squanto, Tecumseh, Pontiac, Chief Joseph, Chief Plenty Cups, or Sacajawea, this statuary to be erected in place of the group now disgracing the entrance to the Capitol.

The Commission fully concurred in the report by Mr. Manship and decided to keep the report on file for future reference at such time as Congress enacts the legislation and the matter is referred to this Commission for advice.

11. SUBWAY FOR UNION STATION: The Commission discussed the subject and again inspected the sketch that was considered by the Commission at the meeting on May 9th. The suggestion of a marquee in front of the main arch at the entrance to the Station was again disapproved. It was understood that more detailed plans for a Subway will be submitted in due time. The Secretary reported that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is

studying the project in cooperation with the railroad officials.

12. ANNEX FOR THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD: The Commission discussed the question of kind of stone for the exterior of the proposed Annex for the Federal Reserve Board building. The Chairman presented a letter from the architect of the building, Dr. Cret, as follows:

May 22, 1941.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

As requested by you, I am trying to sum up the discussion of the use of marble against limestone for the Annex of the Federal Reserve Board building. The point of view of the Federal Reserve Board is as follows:

When they had to plan the 1st building, the Annex was simply an adjoined part of the construction program; the tunnel connecting the Annex is already in place under C Street. This tunnel was provided to avoid the necessity for a bridge between the present and future construction. The Annex, however, is an integral part of the present building.

For the same reason, the architect has kept the cornice lines on C St. and along 20th and 21st Sts. at the same height as those of the existing building. These heights were approved by the Park and Planning and by the Fine Arts Commissions. There is no doubt that looking from Constitution Ave. along 20th and 21st Streets, there would be a benefit to the monumental effect to have one material. The opinion of several members of the Fine Arts Commission given on May 9th strongly supports this view, were it not for the question of the plaza appearance.

There is one existing building on this plaza - the War Department building. If everything goes as planned, there will be another symmetrical one on the east. To the north, the planning is still indefinite, as extensive condemnations are required to complete that side which, in any event, is farther away from the plaza proper. The design of the plaza, as adopted by the Park and Planning Commission, provides trees, lawns and pools to make a unit of this plaza, the buildings forming only a background.

The Architect of the Annex recognizes the value of uniformity of material for the plaza if it can be controlled in the future on the north and west sides. The value of this uniformity must not, however, be over-emphasized, and several groups in construction in the City incorporate buildings of different materials (Municipal Center, Capitol Group, White House Group, etc). The weathering process minimizes the differences of color in original materials unless entirely dissimilar as, for instance, red brick against stone. We could find many precedents for the use of one materials for the east and west buildings, and another for the south side, and I do not feel that there would be serious criticism should this variation be sanctioned by the Commission. The buildings are pretty far apart and in no way can be considered as an enclosed plaza.

"A suggestion was made to make the plaza front of the Annex partly in limestone, partly in marble. I myself do not favor this compromise. The limestone does not harmonize well with white marble. Colored marble would, but this is out of the question as it would create much more contrast with the War Department building than an entirely white marble front. Besides, this would have to be carried around the Annex in some form, and it would do more harm than good.

"My personal view, given entirely as a private individual, has from the beginning, been that the matter was not of very great importance, and I stated a year ago that being open-minded about the use of either marble or stone, I was quite ready to abide by the judgment of the Commission."

"However, the Board of Governors has since shown a decided preference for marble, and if the Commission sees its way to give them satisfaction on this point, I know that the Board would be very grateful."

Very sincerely yours,
Paul P. Cret."

Also the Chairman read the following letter received from

Hon. M. C. Tarver, House of Representatives, on the subject:

May 20, 1941.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I am advised that a plan is under consideration with regard to the materials to be used in the construction of an addition to the Federal Reserve Building and that the use of limestone is recommended.

The construction of an addition to this fine, marble building out of limestone so shocks every sensibility of harmony and good taste that it is difficult to conceive of any reason why such a travesty should be considered. I would appreciate your giving me complete information as to the present status of this matter and whether or not representatives from marble producing sections may be heard in opposition to the proposal at any appropriate time.

Very truly yours,
M. C. Tarver."

Also the Chairman read a letter received from Hon. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, in which Mr. Eccles summed up arguments for a marble building, similar to those presented by Dr. Miller at the meeting of the Commission on May 9th (Exhibit I)

The Commission recalled that at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on September 10, 1940, this matter had been carefully considered

"A suggestion was made to have the plan of the house
partly in limestone, partly in marble. I would not have this
compromise. The limestone does not harmonize well with the
marble. Colored marble would, but this is not of the marble as
it would create more contrast with the marble than existing
than an entirely white marble floor. Besides, this would have to be
carried around the house in some form, and it would do more harm
than good.

"My personal view, given entirely as a private individual, has
from the beginning, been that the matter was not of very great
importance, and I stated a year ago that being of opinion that the
use of either marble or stone, I was quite ready to allow of the
judgment of the Commission.

"However, the Board of Governors has since shown a decided
preference for marble, and if the Commission sees its way to give
their sanction on this point, I know that the Board would be
very grateful.

Very sincerely yours,
Paul P. Gutz.

Also the Chairman read the following letter received from

Hon. H. C. Tarrow, House of Representatives, on the subject:

My dear Sir,

Dear Mr. Gutz:

I am advised that a plan is under consideration with regard
to the use of marble to be used in the construction of an addition
to the Federal Reserve Building and that the use of limestone
is recommended.

The construction of an addition to this fine, marble building
out of limestone is a shock every community of marble and good
taste that it is difficult to conceive of any reason why such a
project should be considered. I would consider your giving me
complete information as to the present status of this matter and
whether or not representatives from marble producing sections may
be heard in opposition to the proposal at any appropriate time.

Very truly yours,
H. C. Tarrow.

Also the Chairman read a letter received from Hon. William H. Hoel,

Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank, in which

Mr. Hoel stated up arguments for a marble building, similar to those

presented by Mr. Miller at the meeting of the Commission on May 20th (Exhibit 1)

The Commission recalled that at the meeting of the Commission of

the date on September 10, 1901, after the Board had decided

and the use of limestone had been agreed upon. After discussion, the Commission reaffirmed the view heretofore expressed that---

- (a) The buildings north of C Street are in a limestone area, dictated by the Interior Department Building and the new War Department Bldg.
- (b) The marble buildings along Constitution Avenue should have buildings back of them that are subordinate in appearance.
- (c) The plaza at the intersection of New York and Virginia Avenues should have a uniform appearance.

Later in the afternoon Congressman Sam Hobbs appeared before the Commission and discussed the subject. He said he represented 71 Members of Congress from marble districts throughout the United States, who are urging the use of marble for the proposed Addition to the Federal Reserve Board Building. Mr. Hobbs said he regretted that limestone was decided upon for the War Department building and he hoped in the years to come it could be given a marble veneer.

The Chairman explained the views of the Commission of Fine Arts in this matter, emphasizing the fact that the Commission had not reversed itself in the decision reached on September 10, 1940, that the Annex to the Federal Reserve Board building should be built of limestone, and when a report was sent to the Federal Reserve Board accordingly.

Mr. Lamb said: "I think it is more important that that building should be in harmony with the other buildings on the square than be related to some building next to it across C Street. If that were another Department building there would be no question about that. You will see the building most decidedly from the big square. It belongs to the square and should be in harmony with it."

Congressman Hobbs then asked if Members of Congress could be heard on the subject at a future meeting of the Commission. The Chairman, in behalf of the Commission, granted this request. Also he sent a reply to Congressman Tarver (Exhibit J), with a copy to Congressman Hobbs, and a reply to Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board (Exhibit J-1)

(Congressman Tarver, by letter of June 3d, replied that arrangements would be made for the proposed Hearing some time soon)

and the use of limestone had been shown upon. After a discussion, the Commission reaffirmed the view heretofore expressed.

- (a) The building shown of a certain size in a limestone quarry, situated on the left of the building, and the use of limestone.
- (b) The building shown of a certain size in a limestone quarry, situated on the left of the building, and the use of limestone.
- (c) The plans of the investigation of the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone.

Later in the afternoon, Congressman Hobbs appeared before the Commission and discussed the subject. He said he represented the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone. He said he represented the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone. He said he represented the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone.

The Chairman explained the views of the Commission of the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone. He said he represented the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone. He said he represented the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone. He said he represented the limestone quarry, and the use of limestone.

Congressman Hobbs then asked if members of Congress could be heard on the subject of a future meeting of the Commission. The Chairman, in behalf of the Commission, granted this request. Also he sent a copy to Congressman Hobbs, and a reply to Congressman Hobbs, with a copy to Congressman Hobbs, and a reply to Congressman Hobbs.

13. RELOCATION OF THE MCMILLAN FOUNTAIN: Mr. Donald L. Kline, landscape architect, submitted in behalf of the National Park Service a plan for locating the McMillan Fountain on the Reservation south of the Mall at Fourth Street and Maryland Avenue.

The Commission considered the design and decided that it seemed the fountain was somewhat small for that large Reservation. The Commission, thereupon, recommended that the National Park Service give further study to the matter and suggested possibly a site west of the Department of Commerce Building at 15th and E Streets, Northwest. Mr. Kline reported that the War Department has made only \$5,000 available for the work, whereas the J. F. Manning Company has reported it would cost nearly \$8,000 to relocate the fountain. Mr. Kline said in the event additional funds are not secured, it may become necessary to leave the fountain at the Reservoir site in McMillan Park:

14. STUDY FOR WALK ON THE WEST SIDE OF ROCK CREEK UNDER THE NEW MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE BRIDGE:

May 23, 1941.

Memorandum for M. H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts.

Further reference is made to Mr. Clarke's letter of May 12, to Mr. Drury, concerning the problem of the parapet wall adjacent to the west abutment to the New Massachusetts Avenue Bridge, which question had been re-opened at the request of this office, at the meeting on May 9. The following situation has arisen:

This additional wall adjacent to the west abutment was not in the original plans for the New Massachusetts Avenue Bridge. It was put in as an extra to the contract by the District upon request of this office in letter dated September 3, 1940, due to the difficulty of getting the separated parkway roadways, the foot-paths, and bridle-trails through the limited span of 150 feet through the new bridge, revet the creek to protect the roadways, and still give sufficient waterway clearance for the stream. This was necessitated because the stonework in the contract drawings of the bridge does not carry below the spring-line

1. The first item on the agenda was the report of the Committee on the progress of the work done during the last year. The Committee reported that it had completed its work and had submitted its report to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors had approved the report and had recommended that the Committee be reappointed for the next year.

The Committee also reported that it had completed its work on the proposed new building for the Board of Directors. The Committee had recommended that the Board of Directors should build a new building on the site of the old building. The Board of Directors had approved the recommendation and had authorized the Committee to proceed with the work. The Committee had also reported that it had completed its work on the proposed new building for the Board of Directors. The Committee had recommended that the Board of Directors should build a new building on the site of the old building. The Board of Directors had approved the recommendation and had authorized the Committee to proceed with the work.

The Committee also reported that it had completed its work on the proposed new building for the Board of Directors. The Committee had recommended that the Board of Directors should build a new building on the site of the old building. The Board of Directors had approved the recommendation and had authorized the Committee to proceed with the work.

Site in McMillan Park:

1. The first item on the agenda was the report of the Committee on the progress of the work done during the last year.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

May 23, 1941

Memorandum for the Board of Directors,
Secretary, Committee on the Site.

Further reference is made to the letter of May 15, 1941, regarding the proposed new building for the Board of Directors. The Committee has completed its work on the proposed new building for the Board of Directors. The Committee has recommended that the Board of Directors should build a new building on the site of the old building. The Board of Directors has approved the recommendation and has authorized the Committee to proceed with the work.

This additional will subject to the work done during the last year. The Committee has completed its work on the proposed new building for the Board of Directors. The Committee has recommended that the Board of Directors should build a new building on the site of the old building. The Board of Directors has approved the recommendation and has authorized the Committee to proceed with the work.

which is at approximately elevation 29 with the water level at elevation 17. The District agreed to this proposal and incorporated the wall adjacent to the west abutment as an extra to the bridge contract on the basis of stone parapet.

"In accordance with the wishes of the Commission of Fine Arts we have requested the District to substitute the wood rail in lieu of the stone parapet on top of this wall. We are informed by the District of Columbia that such a change cannot be made as the bridge contract is on a unit price basis and no item for wood construction of this type exists in the contract.

"In view of the above, and also in light of the extra added expense of maintaining the wood rail over and above that of the stone parapet, it is requested that, if possible, the Commission at its meeting tomorrow consider these factors as we see no way of making the change desired at this time. It is believed that if, in the original design of the bridge, the problems of getting the main parkway circulation and the creek through the new span - which was the chief reason for construction of the bridge - had been properly studied, no necessity for this wall would have arisen; however, with the limited 150-span of the bridge, which this Service had always claimed was too tight, there seems to be no alternative.

Irving C. Root, Superintendent."

The Commission considered the matter. Mr. Clarke said to build the parapet wall as proposed would be unfortunate both from an aesthetic and a sanitary standpoint. He suggested that the wall be kept flush and that an iron railing be placed thereon. The Commission concurred in this suggestion, and a report was sent to Mr. Root accordingly (Exhibit K)

15. MARCONI MEMORIAL: The Commission inspected the Marconi Memorial that had been erected at 16th and Lamont Streets by the J. F. Manning Company of this city. It was noted that the Memorial had been erected in accordance with the design, namely a bust of Marconi (which is in bronze) on a 7 foot pedestal of Stony Creek Granite, in back of which is a shaft 13 feet high of similar stone, surmounted by an allegorical figure of a woman, said by the sculptor, Attilio Piccirilli, to signify an electric wave. The Commission thought the work had been done in a satisfactory manner.

The Commission adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

COPY

May 26, 1941.

Dear Mr. MacDonald:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1941, approved the plan you submitted for the development of East Capitol Street, designed for your office by Jay Downer and Gilmore D. Clarke.

The Commission recognized in the Plan a splendid scheme for developing the area east of the Capitol for a stretch of two miles and conforming to the Plan for the Mall over a like area west of the Capitol. This provides for a great central composition for the National Capital that is not excelled in any other capital city.

The Commission took note of important features in the Plan, such as location for monumental public buildings or semi-public buildings to flank East Capitol Street and subordinate buildings in back of them. Also the Commission felt the proposed tunnels through Capitol Hill along the line of Constitution Avenue and Independence Avenue, and the general arrangement of streets as provided for in the Plan, would bring about a great improvement in traffic conditions in the area. The Commission hope that arrangements can soon be made to begin carrying out the Plan.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Wm. F. Lamb,
Vice Chairman.

Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald,
Commissioner, Public Roads
Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

May 26, 1941.

Dear Mr. MacDonald:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1941, approved the plan you submitted for the development of West Capitol Street, designed for your office by Jay Byrnes and Clarence D. Clarke.

The Commission recognized in the plan a splendid scheme for developing the area east of the Capitol for a stretch of two miles and continuing to the Hill over a like area west of the Capitol. This provides for a great central composition for the National Capital that is not excelled in any other capital city.

The Commission took note of important features in the plan, such as location for monumental public buildings or semi-public buildings to flank West Capitol Street and subordinate buildings in back of them. Also the Commission felt the proposed tunnels through Capitol Hill along the line of Constitution Avenue and Independence Avenue, and the general arrangement of streets as provided for in the plan, would bring about a great improvement in traffic conditions in the area. The Commission hopes that arrangements can soon be made to begin carrying out the plan.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Wm. F. Lamb,
Vice Chairman.

Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald,
Commissioner, Public Works
Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

COPY

May 26, 1941.

My dear Mr. Finley:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on May 24th, it was decided to refer the enclosed correspondence to the Special Committee on White House Furnishings, and to you in particular for a report at the next meeting of that Committee on June 9th. The Commission felt that if the portrait is in fact "one of the six best" by Gilbert Stuart, the matter is deserving of very careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary.

Hon. David E. Finley, Director,
National Gallery of Art,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT B

May 26, 1941.

My dear Mr. Finley:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on May 24th, it was decided to refer the enclosed correspondence to the Special Committee on White House Furnishings, and to you in particular for a report at the next meeting of that Committee on June 28th. The Commission felt that if the portrait is in fact "one of the best" by Gilbert Stuart, the matter is deserving of very careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Gammeter,

Secretary.

Hon. David E. Finley, Director,
National Gallery of Art,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT B

COPY

May 26, 1941.

Dear Admiral Nimitz:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1941, considered the model you submitted with your letter of May 15th for the China Service Medal. The model was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Paulanship, sculptor, member of the Commission, who reported as follows:

"It is unfortunate that the Navy Department does not secure finer examples of the medallion art for their medals. The selection of this particular model has evidently been made without aesthetic consideration. The composition, as well as the treatment of form, of this medal is commonplace and without merit."

Accordingly, the Commission of Fine Arts disapproved the model and it is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Rear Admiral C. W. Nimitz, Chief,
Bureau of Navigation,
Navy Department,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT C

May 28, 1941

Dear Admiral Nimitz:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1941, considered the model you submitted with your letter of May 15th for the China Service Medal. The model was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Paul Hanning, sculptor, member of the Commission, who reported as follows:

"It is unfortunate that the Navy Department does not secure finer examples of the medallist art for their medals. The selection of this particular model has obviously been made without aesthetic consideration. The composition, as well as the treatment of form, of this medal is commonplace and without merit."

Accordingly, the Commission of Fine Arts disapproved

the model and it is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Glenn D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Rear Admiral O. W. Nimitz, Chief,
Bureau of Navigation,
Navy Department,
Washington, D. C.

ENCLOSURE

COPY

May 27, 1941.

My dear Mr. Bruce:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1941, were pleased to inspect the models for sculpture proposed for the War Department Building at your office.

The Commission approved the design of the relief by Jean de Marco, to be placed under the portico on the main facade, with the following comments by Mr. Manship:

"I suggest that the barn in the secondary plane of the agricultural composition be restudied and perhaps eliminated. Also I suggest securing better balance in the ladder-fruit gathering composition, making the design vertically with the kneeling figure at the base of the ladder. Otherwise approved with enthusiasm."

With regard to the sculptural groups to flank the entrance, the Commission understand that the sculptors are to submit further studies before formal submission of the models to the Commission of Fine Arts.

The revised design for the eagle by Henry Kreis, showing the eagle with his head turned and the wings given fuller treatment, the Commission of Fine Arts approved unanimously and recommended that the sculptor be authorized to complete it. The Commission felt the revised model was a great improvement over the first design submitted.

During the inspection of the models at the War Department building, the Commission felt that the eagle over the entrance and the proposed large flanking sculptural groups would be sufficient, omitting the two "soldier groups" which were designed to flank the eagle. The Commission were unanimous in Mr. Poor's suggestion that these "soldier groups" be placed one on each of the side walls of the entrance lobby in the War Department building, flanking the proposed mural painting.

The Commission suggest that Mr. Kreis be consulted in the matter and that his views be ascertained concerning this suggestion, securing from him a statement as to the treatment of these groups for the interior of the building. The Commission are of the opinion that in these new locations the "soldier groups" will gain greater distinction as well as serve admirably as sculptural decoration where it is needed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Hon. Edward Bruce, Chief,
Section of Fine Arts,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D.C.

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT D

May 27, 1921.

My dear Mr. Prince:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1921, were pleased to inspect the models for sculpture proposed for the War Department Building at your office. The Commission approved the design of the relief by Jean de Laon, to be placed under the portico on the main facade, with the following comments by Mr. Manship:

"I suggest that the form in the secondary plane of the architectural composition be restudied and perhaps eliminated. Also I suggest securing better balance in the ladder-first gathering composition, making the design vertically with the kneeling figure at the base of the ladder. Otherwise approved with enthusiasm."

With regard to the sculptural groups to flank the entrance, the Commission understands that the sculptors are to submit further studies before formal submission of the models to the Commission of Fine Arts. The revised design for the eagle by Henry Kreis, showing the eagle with his head turned and the wings given fuller treatment, the Commission of Fine Arts approved unanimously and recommended that the sculptor be authorized to complete it. The Commission felt the revised model was a great improvement over the first design submitted. During the inspection of the models at the War Department Building, the Commission felt that the eagle over the entrance and the proposed large flanking sculptural groups would be sufficient, omitting the two "soldier groups" which were designed to flank the eagle. The Commission were unanimous in Mr. Poor's suggestion that these "soldier groups" be placed one on each of the side walls of the entrance lobby in the War Department Building, flanking the proposed mural painting. The Commission suggest that Mr. Kreis be consulted in the matter and that his views be ascertained concerning this suggestion, securing from him a statement as to the treatment of these groups for the interior of the building. The Commission are of the opinion that in these new locations the "soldier groups" will gain greater distinction as well as serve admirably as sculptural decoration where it is needed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Silmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Howard Bruce, Chief,
Section of Fine Arts,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D.C.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington

June 9, 1941.

My dear Mr. McLeary:

Hon. Edward Bruce, Chief of the Section of Fine Arts, Federal Works Agency, submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts the design for your proposed mural painting in the War Department Building. The Commission were well pleased with the design and congratulate you on this achievement.

Some publicity was given to the design, pursuant to which a letter of protest was received from the National Education Association and the Teachers College of Columbia University that "Education" had not been represented in the painting. The matter was referred to Mr. Henry Varnum Poor and Mr. Edward Bruce, members of the Commission of Fine Arts, as a committee for report, and Mr. Poor reported in behalf of the committee as follows:

"---I would remind any people with particularized interests, such as the Education group, not to be short-sighted as to fail to see their own cherished institutions as the logical outgrowth of the freedom of speech--of press--of assembly--of worship, and not to feel slighted if they do not find any actual and recognizable schoolhouse in the mural. I am, however, so aware of the tremendous part Public Education has played in the development of American institutions and life that I suggest sending all this correspondence to Mr. McLeary with the humble plea that he find, if possible, some place in the mural for at least one tiny recognizable schoolhouse and book."

The Commission of Fine Arts favor embodying the above suggestion in the design.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Kindred McLeary,
Carnegie Institute of Technology,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

EXHIBIT E

COPY

May 28, 1941.

Dear Mr. Kerlin:

In further reference to your letter of April 24th, I have to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at two of their meetings, have given very careful consideration to the question of placing the mural painting which depicts the steel industry, by Clara Fargo Thomas, in the delivery room of the library, east wall, of the Department of Commerce building, and at both meetings the suggestion was unanimously disapproved. An inspection of the location in the library was made at a meeting of the Commission held on May 9th, and it was found inadvisable to place the painting under the arched treatment of the east wall. The Commission felt that at some future time a painting illustrating the activities of the Department of Commerce should be painted specifically for the location in question.

The Commission raise no question concerning the ability of the artist. It is simply that a large mural painting executed for a World's Fair should not be given a place in one of the monumental Government buildings in Washington, in a location for which it was not designed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Malcolm Kerlin,
Administrative Assistant to
The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit F

May 28, 1941.

Dear Mr. Kerlin:

In further reference to your letter of April 24th, I have to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at two of their meetings, have given very careful consideration to the question of placing the mural painting which depicts the steel industry, by Clara Fargo Thomas, in the delivery room of the library, east wall, of the Department of Commerce building, and at both meetings the suggestion was unanimously disapproved. An inspection of the location in the library was made at a meeting of the Commission held on May 13th, and it was found inadvisable to place the painting under the arched treatment of the east wall. The Commission felt that at some future time a painting illustrating the activities of the Department of Commerce should be painted specifically for the location in question. The Commission raises no question concerning the ability of the artist. It is simply that a large mural painting executed for a World's Fair should not be given a place in one of the monumental government buildings in Washington, in a location for which it was not designed. For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

Gilmore D. Clark,
Chairman.

Exhibit 7

Mr. Malcolm Kerlin,
Administrative Assistant to
The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

COPY

May 26, 1941.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1941, approved the designs you submitted with your letter of May 17, 1941, for a temporary office building at 26th Street and Constitution Avenue, and at 22d and 23d, C and E Streets, Northwest, subject to the approval of the sites by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The Commission assumes that these structures are for use during the present emergency and that they will be demolished at the termination of this emergency period.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G

May 26, 1941

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24, 1941, approved the design for submitted with your letter of May 17, 1941, for a temporary office building at 28th Street and Constitution Avenue, and at 28th and 29th, C and H Streets, Northwest, subject to the approval of the sites by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commission assumes that these structures are for use during the present emergency and that they will be demolished at the termination of this emergency period.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D.C.

ENCLOSURE

COPY

May 24, 1941.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, had under consideration a plan for an apartment building at 2001 E Street, N.W., submitted by the Inspector of Buildings on April 25th (Application No.907).

The Commission gave tentative approval to the plan, subject to the submission of working drawings and a list of materials of construction, such as sample of brick and other building materials to be used.

However, in view of the fact that Square 104, in which this building is to be located, is in an area that Congress has set aside for public buildings (under the Public Buildings Act of 1926 as amended) and has authorized its purchase, and since it has been reported that an effort is being made by officials of the Government to acquire the remaining privately owned parcels in this square, the Commission of Fine Arts recommend that erection of this apartment building be held in abeyance as long as possible until the interests of the Government in this matter have been settled.

A part of Square 104 has already been acquired by the Alley Dwelling Authority. For the Commission of Fine Arts:

The Commissioners of the
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Respectfully yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT H

May 24, 1941

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, had under consideration a plan for an apartment building at 2001 M Street, N.W., submitted by the Inspector of Buildings on April 23rd (Application No. 907).

The Commission gave tentative approval to the plan, subject to the submission of working drawings and a list of materials of construction, such as sample of brick and other building materials to be used.

However, in view of the fact that Square 104, in which this building is to be located, is in an area that Congress has set aside for public buildings (under the Public Buildings Act of 1926 as amended) and has authorized its purchase, and since it has been reported that an effort is being made by officials of the Government to acquire the remaining privately owned parcels in this square, the Commission of Fine Arts recommends that erection of this apartment building be held in abeyance as long as possible until the interests of the Government in this matter have been settled.

A part of Square 104 has already been acquired by the United States Housing Authority.


For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

The Commissioners of the
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

William D. Claiborne,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT H



BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

May 24, 1941.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Dr. Miller has told me of the kind reception you afforded him and Mr. Morrill when they appeared before your Commission recently to discuss with you the reasons for our desire to use marble in the exterior of the proposed addition to the present building of the Board of Governors. As you recall, Dr. Miller was the Chairman of the Board's building committee which selected our site and supervised the preparation of the designs and the construction of the present building. This building, I believe, has evoked as much favorable comment as any building that has been constructed in Washington in many years and it is our sincere hope that the public will view the addition with the same approval. For this reason, as well as his very unusual interest in architectural developments, the Board prevailed upon Dr. Miller to act as its adviser in relation to the addition.

I trust that in asking you to present this letter to the full Commission I am not unnecessarily imposing upon your time. I do this because of the assurances that were given me by both Dr. Miller and Mr. Morrill that the Commission showed every disposition to acquaint itself with our views and that it gave the impression that our position had sufficient merit to warrant review and reconsideration of this whole matter both from an esthetic standpoint and also from the standpoint of the Board's feeling that the addition, being an intimately related part of the total building project of the Federal Reserve, and being of a harmonious type of architecture, would naturally be of the same material.

I think it may be safely assumed that the public, in visiting and viewing the two buildings in close juxtaposition to each other and united by passageway and other physical facilities as well as by ownership and control, would consider them as kith and kin and would not understand why they were not constructed of the same material. They may well wonder whether the Board had sacrificed esthetic considerations for a possible saving of dollars or even for some less cogent reason growing out

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke

-2-

May 24, 1941.

of a controversy, political in its nature, in which the Board was not heard.

This point of view is a consideration, if I may venture so to suggest, that should not be overlooked by the Commission. In the last analysis, the public will be the judge of the success of the architectural treatment of the area of which the Federal Reserve Building will form a part and it is particularly because of this that I am writing to ask the Commission not to allow its decision in this matter to be determined by an earlier ruling that was made with a different set of circumstances in contemplation.

A further consideration which we believe will justify the Commission in viewing this matter unembarrassed by any consideration other than the esthetic will be found in the circumstance that the Federal Reserve has an independent status different from that of government departments generally. While the Board is a governmental body the title to the site of the present building and the addition is vested exclusively in the Board and it was specifically authorized by Congress to cause to be constructed on its site a building suitable for its purposes and to enlarge such building and to have sole control thereof, the cost to be paid through assessments against the Federal Reserve Banks. Consequently, the expense of this project, including the determination of the question whether marble or limestone should be used, is a responsibility placed upon the Board by law which does not call for any action by Congress.

When the Board acquired the present site it understood that the Fine Arts Commission was of the opinion that the buildings in the northwest rectangle, which included the Board's site, should be constructed of marble and therefore that when the Board's plans were presented, the Fine Arts Commission would, as it did, specify marble as the material to be used. At that time it was known that a site of sufficient size had been selected so that when the need arose there would be an addition or annex which would be connected physically with the present building by tunnel or otherwise. With this in mind, a tunnel was constructed under "C" Street. Through ownership and operation the building and its addition would be simply two parts of a single conception. Had "C" Street not already been in existence it probably would not have been laid out after the Board acquired the property and we believe that the Commission assumed at that time, as we have done, that the addition would

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke

-3-

May 24, 1941.

naturally and properly be of a design which would agree in material as well as architecture with the present building.

In this connection, when we reviewed Dr. Cret's designs, he directed attention to the fact that the 20th and 21st Street elevations were in line with each other at the cornice heights and that in other ways the facades, whether viewed from Constitution Avenue or from the north along the 20th and 21st Street sides, would give the impression of a unified design. We feel that this desirable impression would be impaired if they were not of the same material. May I add that it seems to me also that the use of marble on the south side of the proposed plaza would make a pleasing variation in the treatment of this large area whereas the drab uniformity of limestone on all sides might have quite the contrary effect from the public standpoint.

Dr. Cret of course has refrained from taking any position in this matter because of his position as a member of the Fine Arts Commission, although I am sure that he would not differ from the views which I am expressing, and Mr. Livingston, who represents Dr. Cret, would prefer marble if the Commission would see fit to approve its use.

When Dr. Cret laid the preliminary drawings for the addition before the Commission the Board was advised that the approval of the Commission required the use of limestone. From what I have said, you will understand the surprise of the Board when it learned of this decision. After carefully considering this development, the Board authorized me to arrange with Dr. Miller to discuss the matter with your Commission. He received from your Commission a most courteous and ample opportunity to present his views. He learned that the Commission's action was an outgrowth of a discussion which took place at the time of the consideration of the plans for the construction of the new War Department building west of 21st Street, at which time the Commission I understand was confronted with opposing interests representing limestone and marble. The Commission of course did not have before it at that time the plans for the Board's addition. However, Dr. Miller reports that the Commission indicated to him a feeling that it might be precluded from approving marble for the Board's addition by the fact that its decision with respect to limestone for the War Department building envisioned the use of that material for all buildings facing on the new plaza between 20th and 21st Streets. This feeling, it seems to me, did not take into account the very substantial difference in the considerations

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke

-4-

May 22, 1941.


to which I have referred as affecting the Board's project.

Mr. Morrill left with you the drawings of the exterior elevations of our proposed addition and I am told that you feel, as we do, that they indicate another outstanding architectural achievement in this area, which will be thoroughly in harmony with the present building and with the general environment. We therefore believe that the use of marble would be particularly appropriate, and that the Commission would be justified in approving it, provided of course its use would not violate some fundamental esthetic principle of which I am not aware.

In this connection, some time ago when the matter was first under consideration by the Board I sought the views of Mr. Frederic A. Delano as to whether, from the standpoint of the best interests of this area as well as those of the Federal Reserve, the Board should use marble or limestone. Mr. Delano, as you may know, was one of the original members of the Federal Reserve Board and until recently has served the Federal Reserve System with distinction in various capacities. For this reason, as well as his personal friendship for me, I felt that his views would be helpful. He pointed out that as Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission the question would not be within his official jurisdiction as it belonged to the Fine Arts Commission and that he could express only his personal views. With this understanding, he told me that he felt it would be a mistake for the Board to build with limestone unless it was required to use that material. I am passing this information on to you in the hope that you will consider it helpful.

Thanking you for your very kindly consideration of this matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

A large, elegant handwritten signature in cursive script, likely belonging to Mr. Frederic A. Delano, is written over the typed name.

C O P Y

May 28, 1941.

Dear Congressman Tarver:

Please pardon my delay in replying to your letter of May 20th concerning the materials of construction for the Annex to the Federal Reserve System Building proposed to be erected on "C" Street, N. W.

I am glad to present herewith, in accordance with your request, a brief statement of the status of this matter insofar as this Commission is concerned.

On September 10, 1940, Mr. Paul P. Cret, Architect, presented a Memorandum on the Proposed Annex to the Federal Reserve Board Building, Washington, D. C., in which he described the project in considerable detail. The two final paragraphs only are pertinent:

7. The intention of the architect was to have this building constructed of limestone to conform to the policy for the recent government buildings. However, a question has been raised among members of the Federal Reserve Board as to the propriety of using marble, in order to mark more clearly that both the annex and the present Federal Reserve Building are part of the same administrative agency. This point has merit. Against it can be advanced:

- a. The increased cost which may amount to \$350,000.
- b. The desire to keep all buildings on the future plaza of uniform materials.

The advice of the Commission of Fine Arts on this point would be most valuable.

After full discussion of this matter, and after the Commission had again familiarized themselves with the site, it was voted unanimously to approve the design for the Annex of the Federal Reserve System Building with limestone for the exterior, as recommended by the Architect.

The Commission believe that it is more important to have this Annex built in a material of a color and texture to harmonize with the War Department Building, than to provide a stone to harmonize with the Federal Reserve System Building on Constitution Avenue.

Exhibit J

That part of the War Department Building now erected, the proposed Annex to the Federal Reserve System Building, and two future buildings to be erected on land owned by the United States or authorized for purchase by the Congress, will form a great Square and, in the judgment of the members of this Commission, the buildings fronting thereon shall harmonize with one another architecturally in every particular. Accordingly, on September 11, 1940, the Chairman addressed the following communication to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System:

"The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 10, 1940, approved the design submitted by Dr. Paul P. Cret, architect, for the addition to the Federal Reserve Board Building, to the north of your main building, facing C Street.

"The Commission approved the use of limestone for the building, for, while the building will be occupied by offices of the Federal Reserve Board, it will be part of a composition more particularly related to the new War Department Building, which is being faced with limestone.

"For the Commission of Fine Arts:"

The Commission of Fine Arts met again in Washington on Saturday, May 24th, at which time your letter, together with communications from the Hon. M. S. Eacles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Mr. Paul P. Cret, Architect of the proposed building, were read. The Hon. Sam Hobbs presented his views on behalf of marble as the appropriate material for the proposed new building.

Again the Commission gave most painstaking attention to this important matter and after careful deliberation confirmed the action taken on September 10, 1940, stated briefly in my letter to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and quoted heretofore in this letter.

The Commission of Fine Arts has established for its guidance, a broad general policy with respect to the important materials of construction for buildings in the Central Composition of the National Capital extending from the Anacostia to the Potomac, since they believe that a definite policy seems necessary and desirable in the

interests of the aesthetic development of Washington. You may be interested to know that it is felt that marble is the most precious material for building construction and as such should be reserved for those buildings which are accorded the most important locations, for example (a) along the Mall, (b) on Constitution Avenue, west of the Monument Grounds, and (c) along both sides of East Capitol Street from the Supreme Court and the Library of Congress to Anacostia Park, to mention only the most important areas.

I was authorized to say to Congressman Hobbs that, if it is your wish, the Commission will be most happy to accord a hearing to those interested in being heard on the subject of building materials for the proposed Annex Building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Cordially yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

Hon. Malcolm C. Tarver
House of Representatives
of United States
Washington, D. C.

COPY

May 26, 1941.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Commission of Fine Arts were pleased to have your letter of May 24th which was read at a meeting held in Washington the same day.

The members of the Commission have given careful study to the whole problem concerned with determining the most appropriate material for the Federal Reserve Building Annex. After reviewing the problems again the Commission has come to the unanimous conclusion that it is more important to have this Annex built in a material of a color and texture to harmonize with the War Department Building and the future buildings to be erected upon lands on the two remaining sides of the great Square, now owned by the United States or authorized for purchase by the Congress, than to provide a stone to harmonize with the present Federal Reserve Building located upon Constitution Avenue. That part of the War Department Building now erected, the proposed Annex to the Federal Reserve System Building, and two future structures to be erected to complete an important grouping of public building to form a great Square should, in the judgment of this Commission, harmonize with one another architecturally in every particular.

The Commission of Fine Arts therefore reaffirms the action taken at its meeting on September 10, 1940, to approve the plans for the Annex to the Federal Reserve System Building as prepared by Mr. Paul P. Cret with the understanding that the exterior be of limestone.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. M. S. Eccles,
Chairman, Board of Governors
of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT J-1

May 28, 1941

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Commission of Fine Arts were pleased to have your letter of May 24th which was read at a meeting held in Washington the same day.

The members of the Commission have given careful study to the whole problem connected with determining the most appropriate material for the Federal Reserve Building Annex. After reviewing the problems again the Commission has come to the conclusion that it is more important to have this Annex built in a material of a color and texture to harmonize with the War Department Building and the future buildings to be erected upon lands on the two remaining sides of the great square, now owned by the United States or authorized for purchase by the Congress, than to provide a stone to harmonize with the present Federal Reserve Building located upon Constitution Avenue. That part of the War Department Building now erected, the proposed Annex to the Federal Reserve System Building, and two future structures to be erected to complete an important grouping of public buildings to form a great square should, in the judgment of this Commission, harmonize with one another architecturally in every particular.

The Commission of Fine Arts therefore recommends the action taken at its meeting on September 10, 1940, to approve the plans for the Annex to the Federal Reserve System Building as proposed by Mr. Paul E. Gret with the understanding that the exterior be of limestone.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. M. S. Reeder,
Chairman, Board of Governors
of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT 7-1

COPY

May 28, 1941.

Dear Mr. Root:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 24th, gave careful consideration to your Memorandum of May 23, 1941, concerning the problem of a parapet wall adjacent to the west abutment to the new Massachusetts Avenue Bridge.

The Commission strongly believe that the parapet wall should not be built in the manner proposed by the District of Columbia authorities, both for aesthetic and sanitary reasons. The Commission recommend, therefore, that the wall be kept flush and that an iron railing be placed thereon.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Irving C. Root, Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT K

185

COPY

May 28, 1941.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Commission of Fine Arts was pleased to have your letter of May 24th which was read at a meeting held in Washington the same day.

Dear Mr. Root:

The members of the Commission have given careful study to the material for the Federal Reserve Building which was presented at their meeting on May 24th, gave careful consideration to your Memorandum of

May 28, 1941, concerning the problem of a parapet wall

adjacent to the west apartment to the new Massachusetts Avenue

Bridge.

The Commission strongly believe that the parapet wall

should not be built in the manner proposed by the District of

Columbia authorities, both for aesthetic and sanitary reasons.

The Commission recommend, therefore, that the wall be kept flush

and that an iron railing be placed thereon.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. M. B. Hoopes,
Chairman, Board of Governors,
Mr. Irving C. Root, Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT K

